

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/944,383

Applicant(s)

CAN ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Cuff

Art Unit

3627

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael Cuff.

(3) _____

(2) Steven Arnheim

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 2/26/04

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: independent claims

Identification of prior art discussed: Issacman et al (6,127,928)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: prior art and claim language was discussed

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

→ with respect to claims 35-37, it appears that the ~~the~~ tracking of item to generate consumer data is not addressed in the rejection, nor taught in the prior art Issacman et al.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Michael Cuff
Examiner's signature, if required